



Prehospital Management of Traumatic Brain Injury across Europe: A CENTER-TBI Study

Benjamin Yaël Gravesteijn , Charlie Aletta Sewalt , Nino Stocchetti , Giuseppe Citerio , Ari Ercole , Hester Floor Lingsma , Nicole von Steinbüchel , Ewout Willem Steyerberg , Lindsay Wilson , Andrew I. R. Maas , David K. Menon , Fiona Elizabeth Lecky & CENTER-TBI collaborators

To cite this article: Benjamin Yaël Gravesteijn , Charlie Aletta Sewalt , Nino Stocchetti , Giuseppe Citerio , Ari Ercole , Hester Floor Lingsma , Nicole von Steinbüchel , Ewout Willem Steyerberg , Lindsay Wilson , Andrew I. R. Maas , David K. Menon , Fiona Elizabeth Lecky & CENTER-TBI collaborators (2020): Prehospital Management of Traumatic Brain Injury across Europe: A CENTER-TBI Study, Prehospital Emergency Care, DOI: [10.1080/10903127.2020.1817210](https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2020.1817210)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2020.1817210>



© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor and Francis Group, LLC



[View supplementary material](#)



Published online: 01 Oct 2020.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 135












[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

PREHOSPITAL MANAGEMENT OF TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY ACROSS EUROPE: A CENTER-TBI STUDY

Benjamin Yaël Gravesteijn, MSc[†] , Charlie Aletta Sewalt, MSc[†] , Nino Stocchetti, MD PhD, Giuseppe Citerio, MD PhD , Ari Ercole, MD PhD , Hester Floor Lingsma, PhD , Nicole von Steinbüchel, PhD, Ewout Willem Steyerberg, PhD , Lindsay Wilson, PhD, Andrew I. R. Maas, MD PhD , David K. Menon, MD PhD , Fiona Elizabeth Lecky, MD PhD  and CENTER-TBI collaborators

ABSTRACT

Background: Prehospital care for traumatic brain injury (TBI) is important to prevent secondary brain injury. We aim to compare prehospital care systems within Europe and investigate the association of system characteristics with the stability of patients at hospital arrival. **Methods:** We studied TBI patients who were transported to CENTER-TBI centers, a pan-European, prospective TBI cohort study, by emergency medical services between 2014 and 2017. The association of demographic factors, injury severity, situational factors, and interventions associated with on-scene time was assessed using linear regression. We used mixed effects models to investigate the case mix adjusted variation between countries in pre-hospital times and interventions. The case mix adjusted impact of on-scene time and interventions on hypoxia (oxygen saturation <90%) and hypotension (systolic blood pressure <100mmHg) at hospital arrival was analyzed with logistic regression. **Results:** Among 3878 patients, the greatest driver of longer on-scene time was intubation (+8.3 min, 95% CI: 5.6–11.1). Secondary referral was associated with shorter on-scene time (-5.0 min 95% CI: -6.2–-3.8). Between countries, there was a large variation in response (range: 12–25 min), on-scene (range: 16–36 min) and travel time (range: 15–32 min) and in prehospital

interventions. These variations were not explained by patient factors such as conscious level or severity of injury (expected OR between countries: 1.8 for intubation, 1.8 for IV fluids, 2.0 for helicopter). On-scene time was not associated with the regional EMS policy ($p=0.58$). Hypotension and/or hypoxia were seen in 180 (6%) and 97 (3%) patients in the overall cohort and in 13% and 7% of patients with severe TBI (GCS <8). The largest association with secondary insults at hospital arrival was with major extracranial injury: the OR was 3.6 (95% CI: 2.6–5.0) for hypotension and 4.4 (95% CI: 2.9–6.7) for hypoxia. **Discussion:** Hypoxia and hypotension continue to occur in patients who suffer a TBI, and remain relatively common in severe TBI. Substantial variation in prehospital care exists for patients after TBI in Europe, which is only partially explained by patient factors. **Key words:** traumatic brain injury; prospective; guidelines; practice; prehospital care

PREHOSPITAL EMERGENCY CARE 2020;00:000–000

INTRODUCTION

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) remains an important cause of death and disability globally (1). Although

no role in the study design, enrollment, collection of data, writing or publication decisions.

[†]Both authors contributed equally.

The authors declare report no conflicts of interest.

Address correspondence to Benjamin Gravesteijn Na-building, room Na-2318, Wytemaweg 80, 3015 CN, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. E-mail: b.gravesteijn@erasmusmc.nl

Supplemental data for this article is available online at <https://doi.org/10.1080/10903127.2020.1817210>.

© 2020 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor and Francis Group, LLC

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

doi:10.1080/10903127.2020.1817210

Received May 5, 2020 from Department of Public Health, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands (BYG, CAS, HFL, EWS); Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Milan University, Milan, Italy (NS); School of Medicine and Surgery, University Milano - Bicocca, Milan, Italy (GC); Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Belgium (AIRM); Division of Anaesthesia, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK (AE, DKM); Institute of Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, Universitätsmedizin Göttingen, Göttingen (NVS); Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands (EWS); Division of Physiology, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK (LW); Center for Urgent and Emergency Care Research, Health Services Research Section, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK (FEL); Emergency Department, Salford Royal Hospital, Salford, UK (FEL). Revision received August 23, 2020; accepted for publication August 24, 2020.

This work was supported by the European Union 7th Framework Program (EC grant 602150). Additional funding was obtained from the Hannelore Kohl Stiftung (Germany), OneMind (USA) and the Integra LifeSciences Corporation (USA). The funders had

rates vary between countries, TBI is estimated to be responsible for around 300 hospital admissions and 12 deaths per 100,000 persons per year in Europe (2).

After the initial TBI, secondary insults, such as hypotension, hypoxia and intracranial hypertension may worsen the brain damage (3,4). Prehospital care for TBI focuses on preventing secondary brain injury by on-scene stabilization and rapid transportation to an appropriate hospital. There is no universally accepted and implemented international guideline aimed at avoiding secondary injury in the prehospital environment. While national guidelines do exist, these vary substantially. Moreover, the extent to which they are adopted and implemented is unclear, since real-life data on international variations in prehospital care are limited. Provider profiling of study centers in the CENTER TBI study (5–7), a large prospective observational cohort study of TBI across Europe and Israel, highlighted substantial reported variation in advanced life support capability of prehospital staff, degree of preference for stabilizing on scene versus immediate transport, and in preferred destination from scene (specialist center versus nearest hospital) (6). However, these reported preferences were based on clinicians' reports of local protocols rather than objective patient data.

Objective assessment of such data is important. There is a tradeoff between prehospital stabilization and prompt transportation to hospital. Stabilizing the patient in the prehospital environment with complex interventions can cause an important time delay reaching the hospital and starting appropriate diagnostic and tailored treatments. This delay could worsen outcome (8). Conversely other studies suggest that stabilizing patients on-scene for transportation to more distant specialist centers could improve outcomes (9–12). The decision between prehospital stabilization and immediate transport is made on-scene by prehospital staff based on clinical parameters, injury characteristics, skill levels available and the local policy.

The current study aimed to compare prehospital management of patients with TBI across Europe, and to investigate the association of prehospital care system characteristics with stability of patients at Emergency Department (ED) arrival.

METHODS

This study is reported according to the STROBE reporting guidelines (13). Ethical approval was obtained from all local institutional revision boards,

according to various national standards (<https://www.center-tbi.eu/project/ethical-approval>).

Study Design

CENTER-TBI is a multicenter, longitudinal, prospective, observational study in 18 countries across Europe which enrolled patients between December 2014 and December 2017 (5). The core cohort includes patients presenting within 24 hours of injury, with a clinical diagnosis of TBI and an indication for computed tomography (6). Analyses in this manuscript were undertaken on the CENTER-TBI dataset (version 2.0), and accessed using a bespoke data management tool, Neurobot (details available on the SciCrunch Resource Identification Portal, using the Research Resource Identifier RRID/SCR_017004).

Prehospital data were collected by physicians and researchers at participating study centers. Unfortunately, no data was available on prehospital physiology. Response time was defined as time between injury and arrival of first EMS crew. On scene time was defined as time between first EMS crew arrival until the conveying crew left the injury scene. Travel time was the time between patient leaving the scene and arrival at first hospital (14). Major extracranial injury (MEI) was defined as any injury in all areas except head with an Abbreviated Injury Score (AIS) above 3.

Patient Selection

Patients with TBI who were transported by ambulance or helicopter to participating hospitals ($n=56$), either directly or by secondary transfer, were included. For the center-level analysis, secondary transfer patients were excluded.

Statistical Analysis

We first compare baseline characteristics between patients that were immediately transported or that were stabilized on scene. This distinction was based on an a-priori defined cutoff of 20 minutes on scene. These two groups (patients who were immediately transported and those who were stabilized on scene) were compared concerning baseline characteristics. Continuous variables were described by the median and interquartile range (IQR). Categorical variables were described by the number of patients and the corresponding percentage.

Second, the drivers of on-scene time, as a continuous variable, were assessed using linear regression. The included predictors were demographic factors (age, sex), severity (GCS, pupil reactivity, major

extracranial injury), situational factors (travel time – as proxy to travel distance, physician at scene, road traffic incident, high energy trauma), and interventions (intubation, IV fluids, CPR, ventilation). Within this analysis, we also assessed the adjusted between-country variation in prehospital times and prehospital interventions with mixed effects modeling. A random intercept for centers was applied to correct for between center differences. To assess the effect of between-center differences, the partial R^2 for the random intercept was calculated by comparing the R^2 of the model with and without random intercept.

Third, the adjusted impact of on-scene times and prehospital interventions (intubation, ventilation, IV fluids, secondary referral) on hypoxia (Saturation <90%) and hypotension (Systolic Blood Pressure <100mmHg) at arrival was assessed with a logistic regression. We adjusted for the following patient characteristics: age, GCS, pupil reactivity, major extracranial injury (15). We also measured the influence of these surrogate prehospital endpoints on functional outcome using ordinal logistic regression, which was adjusted for the aforementioned patient characteristics and utilized the imputed optimized 6-month Extended Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS-E (6)) as the dependent variable. We allowed for a non-linear effect of systolic blood pressure and saturation with restricted cubic splines (3 degrees of freedom).

Fourth, the unadjusted and adjusted between country variation in prehospital times and rates of prehospital interventions (prehospital intubation, IV fluids, helicopter usage) across Europe were illustrated. Bar charts depict unadjusted variation whilst the aforementioned mixed effects model enabled illustration of adjusted variation. Values of the random intercept for country were visually depicted on a map of Europe. Furthermore, the variation was adjusted for the core variables of the prediction model developed in the International Mission for Prognosis and Analysis of Clinical Trials in TBI (IMPACT) study (age, number of reactive pupils, and Glasgow Coma Score at baseline) (15), and the CENTER-TBI stratum (ER/Admission/ICU) in which the patient was enrolled. Also, the median odds ratio (OR) was calculated, which quantifies the expected OR - of interventions performed or times taken - when two randomly picked countries are compared (16).

Additionally, the adjusted on-scene times were compared across centers which had indicated that they have a policy of immediate transportation, or a policy of stabilizing on scene based on the Provider Profiling questionnaires (17). Therefor mixed effects

models were applied, with on-scene time as dependent variable, indicating on-scene policy as independent variable and country as random intercept. The on-scene times were adjusted for GCS, travel time to study center, intubation, pupils and sex.

The effects of continuous predictors were presented as the odds ratio for comparing the 75th and the 25th percentile of the specific variable. This was calculated by multiplying the regression coefficient and standard error by the width of the interquartile range of that variable.

We performed the multiple imputation method to impute the covariates for all regression analyses using the *mice* package in R. The following covariates were included in the imputation model: age, pupil reactivity, GCS, MEI, sex, prehospital intubation, IV fluids, CPR, ventilation, secondary referral and helicopter usage. The percentage of missing data can be found in Table 1. These results were compared with complete case analysis as a sensitivity analysis. The results of the complete case analysis of each analysis are shown in the supplemental material.

All analyses were performed using R (R Core Team (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria). The code applied can be found on https://github.com/bgravesteyn/Code_Core_prehospital.

RESULTS

We included 3878 patients from 56 centers in 17 European Countries from a total of 4509 patients enrolled into the core CENTER TBI study. Patients who had self-presented to hospital without EMS activation (n=616) or where prehospital details were missing or misreported (one country systematically misreported times, n=15), were excluded (Figure S1).

On-Scene Time

The median on-scene time was 22 (IQR: 15-32) minutes, with 1744 (45%) patients having an on-scene time of less than 20 minutes, and 2118 (55%) more than 20 minutes (Table 1). Patients with TBI and longer on-scene times were more severely injured (GCS, pupil reactivity, MEI) and had more complex prehospital interventions (CPR, IV fluids, intubation and ventilation). The two characteristics with the largest association with longer on-scene time were prehospital tracheal intubation (+8.3 min, 95% CI: 5.6-11.1), and secondary referral (-5.0 min, 95% CI: -6.2 - -3.8). Other characteristics with

TABLE 1. Descriptive analysis of patients who received a short on-scene time (<20 min), or long on-scene time (>20 min)

	Overall	On-scene time		p	Missing %
		"Short", <20 min, n = 1744	"Long", >20 min, n = 2118		
Age (median [IQR])	51 [31, 67]	52 [31, 67]	50 [31, 67]	0.518	0.0
Male (%)	2647 (68.3)	1125 (64.5)	1511 (71.3)	<0.001	0.0
MEI (%)	670 (17.3)	209 (12.0)	456 (21.5)	<0.001	0.0
Cause (%)				0.081	10
RTI	1589 (45.6)	699 (44.8)	883 (46.3)		
Fall	1657 (47.5)	756 (48.4)	895 (46.9)		
Violence	191 (5.5)	92 (5.9)	97 (5.1)		
Intentional self-harm	48 (1.4)	14 (0.9)	34 (1.8)		
Type (%)				0.020	1
Closed	3702 (96.5)	1683 (97.4)	2004 (95.7)		
Blast	5 (0.1)	3 (0.2)	2 (0.1)		
Crush	91 (2.4)	27 (1.6)	63 (3.0)		
Penetrating	39 (1.0)	15 (0.9)	24 (1.1)		
Rural area (%)	742 (19.9)	235 (14.0)	502 (24.6)	<0.001	4
Place (%)				0.001	2
Street	2070 (54.6)	985 (57.5)	1077 (52.2)		
Home	941 (24.8)	381 (22.2)	557 (27.0)		
Work/school	240 (6.3)	94 (5.5)	146 (7.1)		
Sport	236 (6.2)	106 (6.2)	129 (6.3)		
Military	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.1)		
Public location	303 (8.0)	148 (8.6)	152 (7.4)		
Highest trained bystander (%)				<0.001	0.5
None	33 (0.9)	5 (0.3)	27 (1.3)		
Bystander	23 (0.6)	17 (1.0)	6 (0.3)		
Paramedic	1173 (30.4)	664 (38.3)	503 (23.9)		
Nurse	658 (17.1)	400 (23.1)	258 (12.3)		
Physician	1044 (27.1)	456 (26.3)	583 (27.7)		
Medical rescue team	926 (24.0)	193 (11.1)	729 (34.6)		
Secondary referral (%)	594 (15.3)	352 (20.2)	241 (11.4)	<0.001	0.0
Arrival Method (%)				<0.001	0.0
Ambulance	3141 (81.0)	1585 (90.9)	1547 (73.0)		
Helicopter	483 (12.5)	97 (5.6)	381 (18.0)		
Mobile medical team	254 (6.5)	62 (3.6)	190 (9.0)		
GCS motor, baseline (median [IQR])	6 [4, 6]	6 [6, 6]	6 [2, 6]	<0.001	2
GCS, baseline (median [IQR])	14 [8, 15]	15 [13, 15]	13 [6, 15]	<0.001	4
Pupils, baseline (%)				<0.001	5
Two reactive	3273 (88.7)	1545 (92.7)	1717 (85.4)		
One reactive	150 (4.1)	53 (3.2)	96 (4.8)		
None reactive	269 (7.3)	69 (4.1)	197 (9.8)		
CPR (%)	51 (1.3)	10 (0.6)	40 (1.9)	0.001	0.0
IV Fluids (%)	1469 (37.9)	442 (25.3)	1019 (48.1)	<0.001	0.0
Intubation (%)	885 (23.7)	123 (7.4)	754 (36.7)	<0.001	4
Supplemental oxygen (%)	1612 (46.3)	485 (31.8)	1118 (57.5)	<0.001	10
Ventilation (%)	815 (22.0)	114 (6.9)	693 (34.1)	<0.001	4
On-scene time (median [IQR])	22 [15, 32]	14 [10, 17]	30 [25, 40]	<0.001	0.4
Arrival time (median [IQR])	17 [10, 30]	16 [10, 30]	18 [10, 30]	0.276	41
Travel time (median [IQR])	18 [11, 28]	15 [10, 23]	20 [12, 32]	<0.001	42
Prehospital time (median [IQR])	62 [44, 90]	45 [32, 60]	80 [61, 109]	<0.001	3

MEI = major extracranial injury; RTI = road traffic incident; GCS = Glasgow coma scale; CPR = cardiopulmonary resuscitation; IV = intravenous.

smaller (though statistically significant) associations with longer on-scene times were travel time to the hospital (on average +0.6 min, 95% CI: 0.34–0.90), having a physician present at scene (+2.1 min, 95% CI: 1.1–3.2), administration of IV fluids (+1.5 min, 95% CI: 0.5–2.4), initiation of ventilatory support (+3.1 min, 95% CI: 0.4–5.7), and male gender (+1.4 min, 95% CI: 0.6–2.3) (Figure 1; Table 1, S1). The full model explained 36% of the variation in on-

scene time (R^2). Of that variation explained, 42% was due to between center differences.

Predictors of Hypotension and Hypoxia

In total, 159 (5%) of the patients arrived at the ED with hypotension, 76 (2%) with hypoxia, and 21 (1%) with both. The proportions of hypoxia and hypotension were higher in severe TBI patients

(defined as a GCS ≤ 8), 90 (11%) arrived with hypotension, 38 (5%) with hypoxia, and 17 (2%) with both (Table 2). Moreover, of the patients who were intubated on-scene, 92 (12%) had hypotension, 31 (4%) had hypoxia, and 14 (2%) had both.

The largest association with secondary insults on arrival was with major extracranial injury: the OR was 3.6 (95% CI: 2.6–5.0) for hypotension and 4.4 (95% CI: 2.9–6.7) for hypoxia. Other patient factors were also independently associated with arrival secondary insults including a higher GCS at scene, which was associated with less hypotension (OR 0.7, 95% CI: 0.5–0.9) and hypoxia (OR 0.6, 95% CI: 0.4–0.8) on arrival; the presence of on scene unilaterally or bilaterally non-reactive pupils(s) predicted arrival hypoxia (OR: 1.9, 95% CI: 1.1–3.1). In terms

of interventions, the requirement for IV fluids was associated with hypotension at arrival (OR 1.8, 95% CI: 1.3–2.5), while prehospital time (average OR 1.1 (1.01–1.20)) predicted hypoxia at arrival (Figure 2; Table 2 S1). The complete case analysis showed the same direction and range of effects (Figure 4 S1). The case mix adjusted variation by country in rates of arrival hypoxia and hypotension was small with a median OR of 1.11 and 1.05 respectively (Figure 6 S1).

The adjusted association of these surrogate endpoints with functional outcome was significant (Figure 5 S1): for saturation, lower values were associated with worse GOSE scores, plateauing at a saturation above 95%. For systolic blood pressure, lower (<100 mmHg) as well as higher (>180 mmHg) values were associated with worse functional outcome.

National Variation

There was large variation between prehospital times across European countries (unadjusted analyses, Figure 3). The shortest prehospital times for primary referrals were seen in Sweden (49 [IQR: 39–64]




FIGURE 1. A forest plot showing the independent effects on on-scene time of demographic factors, injury severity, situational factors, and interventions given. The estimates can be interpreted as follows: this factor increases or decreases the on-scene time by x minutes, independent of the other factors displayed. This is the result of a multivariable mixed effects linear regression model with a random intercept for center conditional on country. The coefficients (and 95% confidence intervals) of the model are displayed. The partial R2 displayed is the percentage of the full model attributable to between country differences. RTI, Road traffic incident; MEI, major extracranial injury; GCS, Glasgow Coma Scale; IQR, interquartile range; CPR, cardiopulmonary resuscitation; IV, intravenous.




FIGURE 2. The effect of demographic factors, injury severity, situational factors, and interventions given on hypotension (systolic blood pressure < 100 mmHg) or hypoxia (oxygen saturation < 90%) at arrival at the emergency department. The effects are based on a logistic multivariable regression model.

TABLE 2. The number and percentage of patients with hypotension or hypoxia at arrival at the ED

	N	Hypotension + Hypoxia	Hypotension	Hypoxia	Neither
Overall	3348	21 (1%)	159 (5%)	76 (2%)	3092 (92%)
Intubated	759	14 (2%)	92 (12%)	31 (4%)	622 (82%)
Not intubated	2485	6 (0%)	62 (2%)	42 (2%)	2375 (96%)
Primary referral	2871	20 (1%)	140 (5%)	67 (2%)	2644 (92%)
Secondary referral	477	1 (0%)	19 (4%)	9 (2%)	448 (94%)
GCS >12	2096	4 (0%)	45 (2%)	26 (1%)	2021 (96%)
GCS 9–12	318	0 (0%)	17 (5%)	9 (3%)	292 (92%)
GCS <9	842	17 (2%)	90 (11%)	38 (5%)	697 (83%)




FIGURE 3. Bar charts showing the time spent in different prehospital phases per country (upper row), and the percentage of prehospital interventions (second row) used. In the upper row, only bars based on more than 10 patients are displayed.




FIGURE 4. The adjusted variation in prehospital time (upper row), and use of key prehospital interventions (bottom row) across Europe. Every map shows the deviation per country from the overall average. In the upper row, the mean of the median time per country is shown. Moreover, secondarily referred patients are excluded from the analysis of travel times, because the time until arrival in the secondary hospital is unknown. The estimates of the random intercepts for each country are displayed. These are adjusted for the IMPACT core variables (age, pupils, and GCS), the CENTER-TBI stratum in which the patient was included, and the random variation at the center level.

minutes) and Serbia (44 [IQR: 28 – 85] minutes) whereas the longest prehospital times were seen in the United Kingdom (96 [IQR: 72 – 127] minutes)

and France (101 [IQR: 74 – 146] minutes). Secondary referral extended the time until arrival at the study hospital to a greater degree (to hours rather than




FIGURE 5. The unadjusted and adjusted log transformed median on-scene times. The bubbles represent the random intercept value for the model predicting on-scene time with center as random intercept. The right panel shows log transformed median on-scene times adjusted for GCS, traveltime, intubation, pupils, and sex (which were identified drivers of on-scene time).

minutes). In Sweden, the time to arrival at the study hospital for secondary referrals was the longest (446 [IQR: 340 – 560] minutes). There was also large between-country variation in therapies the patients were provided with: intubation rates varied from 10% to 88%, iv fluid administration from 22% to 67%, and use of helicopters from 0% to 31%.

After adjusting for case mix, the variation in prehospital times and interventions within Europe remained substantial (Figure 4). The range of response times adjusted for injury severity was 12-25 minutes; the range of on-scene times was 16-36 minutes; and the range of travel times was 15-32 minutes. The range of response times adjusted for injury severity and prehospital interventions was 9-31 minutes; the range of on-scene times was 15-34 minutes; and the range of travel times was 14-32 minutes. The median odds ratio, expected when two randomly picked countries are compared, was 1.8 for prehospital intubation, 1.8 for IV fluids and 2.0 for helicopter. If prehospital times

were also adjusted for the interventions that individual patients received, the model fit improved significantly (likelihood ratio tests, $p < 0.001$). However, the values of the random intercepts (which represent the average difference to the European average) did not differ from the models that only adjust for injury severity (Figure S7).

The unadjusted difference between the on-scene times of centers was not significantly different for patients from study hospitals reporting their EMS having a policy of stabilizing on scene versus a policy of immediate transport ($p = 0.49$) (17). After adjustment, the two centers reporting to have only a policy of immediate transport as part of provider profiling had on average the shortest average on-scene times (Figure 5). However, the overall difference in on-scene times between hospitals that reported the two different prehospital EMS policies was not significant ($p = 0.58$).

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge this is the most comprehensive analysis comparing prehospital care for patients after TBI across Europe. Our multicenter, multinational, prospective cohort study suggests large variations across European countries in the prehospital care provided to patients who suffer a TBI, largely unexplained by patient characteristics. Despite the common availability of national guidelines for prehospital care, patients after TBI continue to present at the ER with hypotension and hypoxia, although these are less common than in the past (6% and 3% of cases, respectively). These physiological insults are commonest in severe TBI, where they occur in 13% and 7% of cases, respectively. The main determinant of such physiological instability on arrival at hospital were major extracranial injuries. We found that the main determinants of longer on-scene times were interventional and situational rather than patient-related, for example on-scene intubation and primary referral to the study center.

However, we also determined that variation across Europe in prehospital times and interventions was only partly concordant with the prehospital policy (immediate transport or stabilize on scene) reported by clinicians in the CENTER TBI provider profiling exercise (6). We discovered that the probability of a patient with TBI being intubated at the injury scene, receiving IV fluids, or being transported by helicopter, was highly dependent on the country where the patient suffered the injury.

Not only did we see variation in prehospital interventions, but also in prehospital times. For on-scene times, this can partially be explained by the variation in provided interventions: for example, we found that prehospital intubation increased the on-scene time by 10 minutes, similar to an American retrospective study (18). Other interventions (IV-fluids, mechanical ventilation) also slightly increased the on-scene times. It is likely that the association of prolonged on-scene time and greater intervention may have been, in part, due to greater injury severity, requiring more on-scene stabilization before transfer. Although this explanation might be true for variations observed concerning the patient-level, the explanation for country-level variation in hospital times requires a different explanation: the diverse geographical landscapes of Europe, and the large between-center variation in the size and type of population of hospital catchment areas are more likely to drive the variation in prehospital times. Unsurprisingly, the use of helicopters was most prevalent in Norway which has large areas with low population density. Interestingly though, the longest total prehospital times (even after

adjustment for patient and some situational factors) occurred in France and the United Kingdom. Potential explanations vary: France had the highest case-mix adjusted rates of prehospital intubation concordant with their surveyed response of stabilizing patients on scene; while the United Kingdom had the highest travel times from scene to hospital, perhaps reflecting traffic congestion and/or recent centralization of major trauma care to just 30 out of over 200 hospitals (8 of which participated in CENTER-TBI).

Despite large variation in performed interventions and prehospital times were observed, the rates of hypoxia and hypotension at arrival at the Emergency Department were lower than those in historical TBI studies: for example, even in severe patients, only 11% had hypotension at arrival, compared to 35% in a large historical study (3, 19). In part, these lower rates may be explained by differences in case selection or definitions: While we only report documented hypoxia, the Traumatic Coma Data Bank also inferred hypoxia if there was clinically reported cyanosis or apnea. For example, we included intoxicated GCS < 9 patients in CENTER-TBI, similar to the study by Miller et al (20), who found a similar incidence of hypotension. Historically, TBI patients not in coma were generally not thought to have sustained a significant injury and imaging by CT scan was rarely conducted if intoxication was thought to be the root cause of a low GCS. Therefore, these patients were not included in historical TBI studies. The lower rates of hypoxia and hypotension at arrival can be explained by a higher inclusion rate of mild TBI patients with less severe extracranial injury than in previous studies. Our study reflects modern Emergency Medicine practice, which is to image all severities of TBI. However, there remains the possibility that prehospital care has simply improved over the last decades – in particular the almost universal use of supplemental oxygen, increased use of tracheal intubation, and the common use of prehospital IV fluids, may have markedly reduced the incidence of hypoxia and hypotension. However, there continues to be room for improvement – both physiological insults still occur at significant rates, particularly in patients after severe TBI.

A limitation of this international, multicenter trial is the proportion of missing data. This is unfortunately unavoidable in such a logistically challenging study. Since complete case analysis is both inefficient, and potentially biased, we imputed the data (21): both single imputation for the on-scene time, as well as multiple imputation for the main analyses were used. The single imputation was reliable, but

not perfect: 60% of the variation could be explained by the model. The misclassification that could have occurred might have biased our results toward the null hypothesis. For the analysis with multiple imputed datasets, similar results were observed as the complete case analysis. This supports the validity of the selected imputation method.

Another limitation is that some prehospital physiological parameters (oxygen saturations and blood pressure) were not entered into the database. We used hypotension and hypoxia at arrival at the Emergency Department as a proxy for secondary insult. However, interventions such as intubation may have restored normal oxygen levels for some patients who were hypoxic at scene. There were some situational factors such as difficult extrication from the scene due to entrapment or stairs that may be valid factors for prolonging on scene times – and vary by country – that we could not account for using the data.

Finally, we acknowledge the fact that the centers that contributed patients to CENTER-TBI are a selected population of centers: these centers were mostly the equivalent of North American level 1 trauma centers (17). Our conclusions are based on extrapolation of the preferences and policies of these specialized centers toward the entire country.

Nevertheless, the prospective nature of the study, the large number of centers and countries, and the size of the CENTER TBI cohort do provide high external validity. Additionally, the data are acquired as “real-world” data, with lenient exclusion criteria. Therefore, we believe our results are applicable to the majority of settings.

We suggest that the large variation in administered prehospital interventions can be explained by two factors. First, the most relevant guidelines for prehospital management of TBI are national guidelines, which vary substantially across countries (7). However, even within countries, local policies vary according to the Provider Profiling questionnaires (22). Moreover, these local policies might not be concordant with practice, as research suggests that the adherence to guidelines is low (23). However, it is also possible that the prehospital guidelines are not (or not perceived as being) relevant to clinical practice in these contexts, and/or may be difficult to implement (24,25). Understanding and reconciling this discordance is essential if we are to provide a better evidence base for clinical practice in these contexts and ensure its appropriate adoption.

Second, the resources for prehospital care vary substantially across Europe. Even for prehospital intubation, for which the benefit – for severe TBI – has been shown in a randomized controlled trial

(26), large variation was observed irrespective of patient factors (27): the practice variation is therefore likely to be also attributable (in part) to variation in resources. In many countries the academic basis for prehospital care is now only becoming a routine part of training for paramedics and other practitioners, whereas it has been established for Hospital based Emergency Medicine for at least 20 years. Some elements of prehospital care – such as helicopters – are costly, so research should also take account of cost-effectiveness. We need to identify prehospital interventions with proven clinical and cost effectiveness, prioritize their integration into guidelines then monitor adherence and impact on outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Across Europe, there are large variations in prehospital interventions for patients after TBI and in the associated on scene times. This variation is only partially explained by patient factors. Additional drivers of variation are likely to include EMS resource and organizational differences, and a low evidence base. While hypoxia and hypotension are less common than observed in past studies, they continue to occur in a substantial minority of patients after TBI, are particularly frequent following severe TBI or extracranial injury, and are associated with substantially worse outcomes. These data make a strong case for further research to facilitate the development and implementation of guidelines that support best practice in the prehospital care of patients with TBI.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The CENTER-TBI participants and investigators:

Cecilia Åkerlund¹, Krisztina Amrein², Nada Andelic³, Lasse Andreassen⁴, Audny Anke⁵, Anna Antoni⁶, Gérard Audibert⁷, Philippe Azouvi⁸, Maria Luisa Azzolini⁹, Ronald Bartels¹⁰, Pál Barzó¹¹, Romuald Beauvais¹², Ronny Beer¹³, Bo-Michael Bellander¹⁴, Antonio Belli¹⁵, Habib Benali¹⁶, Maurizio Berardino¹⁷, Luigi Beretta⁹, Morten Blaabjerg¹⁸, Peter Bragge¹⁹, Alexandra Brazinova²⁰, Vibeke Brinck²¹, Joanne Brooker²², Camilla Brorsson²³, Andras Buki²⁴, Monika Bullinger²⁵, Manuel Cabeleira²⁶, Alessio Caccioppola²⁷, Emiliana Calappi²⁷, Maria Rosa Calvi⁹, Peter Cameron²⁸, Guillermo Carbayo Lozano²⁹, Marco Carbonara²⁷, Simona Cavallo¹⁷, Giorgio Chevallard³⁰, Arturo Chieragato³⁰, Giuseppe Citerio^{31, 32}, Iris Ceyisakar³³, Hans Clusmann³⁴, Mark Coburn³⁵, Jonathan Coles³⁶,

Jamie D. Cooper³⁷, Marta Correia³⁸, Amra Čović³⁹, Nicola Curry⁴⁰, Endre Czeiter²⁴, Marek Czosnyka²⁶, Claire Dahyot-Fizelier⁴¹, Paul Dark⁴², Helen Dawes⁴³, Véronique De Keyser⁴⁴, Vincent Degos¹⁶, Francesco Della Corte⁴⁵, Hugo den Boogert¹⁰, Bart Depreitere⁴⁶, Đula Dilvesi⁴⁷, Abhishek Dixit⁴⁸, Emma Donoghue²², Jens Dreier⁴⁹, Guy-Loup Dulière⁵⁰, Ari Ercole⁴⁸, Patrick Esser⁴³, Erzsébet Ezer⁵¹, Martin Fabricius⁵², Valery L. Feigin⁵³, Kelly Foks⁵⁴, Shirin Frisvold⁵⁵, Alex Furmanov⁵⁶, Pablo Gagliardo⁵⁷, Damien Galanaud¹⁶, Dashiell Gantner²⁸, Guoyi Gao⁵⁸, Pradeep George⁵⁹, Alexandre Ghuysen⁶⁰, Lelde Giga⁶¹, Ben Glocker⁶², Jagoš Golubovic⁴⁷, Pedro A. Gomez⁶³, Johannes Gratz⁶⁴, Benjamin Gravesteijn³³, Francesca Grossi⁴⁵, Russell L. Gruen⁶⁵, Deepak Gupta⁶⁶, Juanita A. Haagsma³³, Iain Haitsma⁶⁷, Raimund Helbok¹³, Eirik Helseth⁶⁸, Lindsay Horton⁶⁹, Jilske Huijben³³, Peter J. Hutchinson⁷⁰, Bram Jacobs⁷¹, Stefan Jankowski⁷², Mike Jarrett²¹, Ji-yao Jiang⁵⁸, Faye Johnson⁷³, Kelly Jones⁵³, Mladen Karan⁴⁷, Angelos G. Koliass⁷⁰, Erwin Kompanje⁷⁴, Daniel Kondziella⁵², Evgenios Koraropoulos⁴⁸, Lars-Owe Koskinen⁷⁵, Noémi Kovács⁷⁶, Ana Kowark³⁵, Alfonso Lagares⁶³, Linda Lanyon⁵⁹, Steven Laureys⁷⁷, Fiona Lecky^{78, 79}, Didier Ledoux⁷⁷, Rolf Lefering⁸⁰, Valerie Legrand⁸¹, Aurelie Lejeune⁸², Leon Levi⁸³, Roger Lightfoot⁸⁴, Hester Lingsma³³, Andrew I.R. Maas⁴⁴, Ana M. Castaño-León⁶³, Marc Maegele⁸⁵, Marek Majdan²⁰, Alex Manara⁸⁶, Geoffrey Manley⁸⁷, Costanza Martino⁸⁸, Hugues Maréchal⁵⁰, Julia Mattern⁸⁹, Catherine McMahon⁹⁰, Béla Melegh⁹¹, David Menon⁴⁸, Tomas Menovsky⁴⁴, Ana Mikolic³³, Benoit Misset⁷⁷, Visakh Muraleedharan⁵⁹, Lynnette Murray²⁸, Ancuta Negru⁹², David Nelson¹, Virginia Newcombe⁴⁸, Daan Nieboer³³, József Nyírádi², Otesile Olubukola⁷⁸, Matej Oresic⁹³, Fabrizio Ortolano²⁷, Aarno Palotie^{94, 95, 96}, Paul M. Parizel⁹⁷, Jean-François Payen⁹⁸, Natascha Perera¹², Vincent Perlberg¹⁶, Paolo Persona⁹⁹, Wilco Peul¹⁰⁰, Anna Piippo-Karjalainen¹⁰¹, Matti Pirinen⁹⁴, Horia Ples⁹², Suzanne Polinder³³, Inigo Pomposo²⁹, Jussi P. Posti¹⁰², Louis Puybasset¹⁰³, Andreea Radoi¹⁰⁴, Arminas Ragauskas¹⁰⁵, Rahul Raj¹⁰¹, Malinka Rambadagalla¹⁰⁶, Jonathan Rhodes¹⁰⁷, Sylvia Richardson¹⁰⁸, Sophie Richter⁴⁸, Samuli Ripatti⁹⁴, Saulius Rocka¹⁰⁵, Cecilie Roe¹⁰⁹, Olav Roise^{110, 111}, Jonathan Rosand¹¹², Jeffrey V. Rosenfeld¹¹³, Christina Rosenlund¹¹⁴, Guy Rosenthal⁵⁶, Rolf Rossaint³⁵, Sandra Rossi⁹⁹, Daniel Rueckert⁶², Martin Rusnák¹¹⁵, Juan Sahuquillo¹⁰⁴, Oliver Sakowitz^{89, 116}, Renan Sanchez-Porras¹¹⁶, Janos Sandor¹¹⁷, Nadine Schäfer⁸⁰, Silke Schmidt¹¹⁸, Herbert Schoecl¹¹⁹, Guus Schoonman¹²⁰, Rico Frederik Schou¹²¹, Elisabeth Schwendenwein⁶, Charlie Sewalt³³, Toril Skandsen^{122,}

¹²³, Peter Smielewski²⁶, Abayomi Sorinola¹²⁴, Emmanuel Stamatakis⁴⁸, Simon Stanworth⁴⁰, Robert Stevens¹²⁵, William Stewart¹²⁶, Ewout W. Steyerberg^{33, 127}, Nino Stocchetti¹²⁸, Nina Sundström¹²⁹, Anneliese Synnot^{22, 130}, Riikka Takala¹³¹, Viktória Tamás¹²⁴, Tomas Tamosuitis¹³², Mark Steven Taylor²⁰, Braden Te Ao⁵³, Olli Tenovuo¹⁰², Alice Theadom⁵³, Matt Thomas⁸⁶, Dick Tibboel¹³³, Marjolein Timmers⁷⁴, Christos Tolia¹³⁴, Tony Trapani²⁸, Cristina Maria Tudora⁹², Peter Vajkoczy¹³⁵, Shirley Vallance²⁸, Egils Valeinis⁶¹, Zoltán Vámos⁵¹, Mathieu van der Jagt¹³⁶, Gregory Van der Steen⁴⁴, Joukje van der Naalt⁷¹, Jeroen T.J.M. van Dijck¹⁰⁰, Thomas A. van Essen¹⁰⁰, Wim Van Hecke¹³⁷, Caroline van Heugten¹³⁸, Dominique Van Praag¹³⁹, Thijs Vande Vyvere¹³⁷, Roel P. J. van Wijk¹⁰⁰, Alessia Vargiolu³², Emmanuel Vega⁸², Kimberley Velt³³, Jan Verheyden¹³⁷, Paul M. Vespa¹⁴⁰, Anne Vik^{121, 141}, Rimantas Vilcinis¹³², Victor Volovici⁶⁷, Nicole von Steinbüchel³⁹, Daphne Voormolen³³, Petar Vulekovic⁴⁷, Kevin K.W. Wang¹⁴², Eveline Wiegers³³, Guy Williams⁴⁸, Lindsay Wilson⁶⁹, Stefan Winzeck⁴⁸, Stefan Wolf¹⁴³, Zhihui Yang¹⁴², Peter Ylén¹⁴⁴, Alexander Younsi⁸⁹, Frederick A. Zeiler^{48, 145}, Veronika Zelinkova²⁰, Agate Ziverte⁶¹, Tommaso Zoerle²⁷

¹Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Section of Perioperative Medicine and Intensive Care, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

²János Szentágothai Research Center, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

³Division of Surgery and Clinical Neuroscience, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Oslo University Hospital and University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

⁴Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromsø, Norway

⁵Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromsø, Norway

⁶Trauma Surgery, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria

⁷Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospital Nancy, Nancy, France

⁸Raymond Poincaré hospital, Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France

⁹Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, S Raffaele University Hospital, Milan, Italy

¹⁰Department of Neurosurgery, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

¹¹Department of Neurosurgery, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary

¹²International Projects Management, ARTTIC, München, Germany

¹³Department of Neurology, Neurological Intensive Care Unit, Medical University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria

¹⁴Department of Neurosurgery & Anesthesia & intensive care medicine, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

¹⁵NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Center, Birmingham, UK

¹⁶Anesthésie-Réanimation, Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France

¹⁷Department of Anesthesia & ICU, AOU Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino - Orthopedic and Trauma Center, Torino, Italy

¹⁸Department of Neurology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

¹⁹BehaviourWorks Australia, Monash Sustainability Institute, Monash University, Victoria, Australia

²⁰Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work, Trnava University, Trnava, Slovakia

²¹Quesgen Systems Inc., Burlingame, California, USA

²²Australian & New Zealand Intensive Care Research Center, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

²³Department of Surgery and Perioperative Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

²⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Medical School, University of Pécs, Hungary and Neurotrauma Research Group, János Szentágotthai Research Center, University of Pécs, Hungary

²⁵Department of Medical Psychology, Universitätsklinikum Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

²⁶Brain Physics Lab, Division of Neurosurgery, Dept of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

²⁷Neuro ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy

²⁸ANZIC Research Center, Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

²⁹Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital of Cruces, Bilbao, Spain

³⁰NeuroIntensive Care, Niguarda Hospital, Milan, Italy

³¹School of Medicine and Surgery, Università Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy

³²NeuroIntensive Care, ASST di Monza, Monza, Italy

³³Department of Public Health, Erasmus Medical Center-University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

³⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Medical Faculty RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

³⁵Department of Anaesthesiology, University Hospital of Aachen, Aachen, Germany

³⁶Department of Anesthesia & Neurointensive Care, Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK

³⁷School of Public Health & PM, Monash University and The Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³⁸Radiology/MRI department, MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK

³⁹Institute of Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, Universitätsmedizin Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

⁴⁰Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust, Oxford, UK

⁴¹Intensive Care Unit, CHU Poitiers, Poitiers, France

⁴²University of Manchester NIHR Biomedical Research Center, Critical Care Directorate, Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Salford, UK

⁴³Movement Science Group, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

⁴⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Edegem, Belgium

⁴⁵Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, Maggiore Della Carità Hospital, Novara, Italy

⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

⁴⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical center of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia

⁴⁸Division of Anaesthesia, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK

⁴⁹Center for Stroke Research Berlin, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Berlin, Germany

⁵⁰Intensive Care Unit, CHR Citadelle, Liège, Belgium

⁵¹Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Therapy, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

⁵²Departments of Neurology, Clinical Neurophysiology and Neuroanesthesiology, Region Hovedstaden Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁵³National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences, Faculty of Health and Environmental Studies, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

⁵⁴Department of Neurology, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

⁵⁵Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive care, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromsø, Norway

⁵⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Hadassah-hebrew University Medical center, Jerusalem, Israel

⁵⁷Fundación Instituto Valenciano de Neuror rehabilitación (FIVAN), Valencia, Spain

⁵⁸Department of Neurosurgery, Shanghai Renji hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University/school of medicine, Shanghai, China

⁵⁹Karolinska Institutet, INCF International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility, Stockholm, Sweden

⁶⁰Emergency Department, CHU, Liège, Belgium

⁶¹Neurosurgery clinic, Pauls Stradins Clinical University Hospital, Riga, Latvia

⁶²Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, UK

⁶³Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain

⁶⁴Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Medical University of Vienna, Austria

⁶⁵College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

⁶⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Neurosciences Center & JPN Apex trauma center, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi-110029, India

⁶⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

⁶⁸Department of Neurosurgery, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

⁶⁹Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK

⁷⁰Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Addenbrooke's Hospital & University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

⁷¹Department of Neurology, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands

⁷²Neurointensive Care, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK

⁷³Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust Acute Research Delivery Team, Salford, UK

⁷⁴Department of Intensive Care and Department of Ethics and Philosophy of Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

⁷⁵Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Neurosurgery, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

⁷⁶Hungarian Brain Research Program - Grant No. KTIA_13_NAP-A-II/8, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

⁷⁷Cyclotron Research Center, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

⁷⁸Center for Urgent and Emergency Care Research (CURE), Health Services Research Section, School of Health and Related Research (SchARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

⁷⁹Emergency Department, Salford Royal Hospital, Salford UK

⁸⁰Institute of Research in Operative Medicine (IFOM), Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany

⁸¹VP Global Project Management CNS, ICON, Paris, France

⁸²Department of Anesthesiology-Intensive Care, Lille University Hospital, Lille, France

⁸³Department of Neurosurgery, Rambam Medical Center, Haifa, Israel

⁸⁴Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospitals Southampton NHS Trust, Southampton, UK

⁸⁵Cologne-Merheim Medical Center (CMMC), Department of Traumatology, Orthopedic Surgery and

Sportmedicine, Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany

⁸⁶Intensive Care Unit, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, Bristol, UK

⁸⁷Department of Neurological Surgery, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA

⁸⁸Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, M. Bufalini Hospital, Cesena, Italy

⁸⁹Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany

⁹⁰Department of Neurosurgery, The Walton center NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK

⁹¹Department of Medical Genetics, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

⁹²Department of Neurosurgery, Emergency County Hospital Timisoara, Timisoara, Romania

⁹³School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden

⁹⁴Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

⁹⁵Analytic and Translational Genetics Unit, Department of Medicine; Psychiatric & Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Department of Psychiatry; Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

⁹⁶Program in Medical and Population Genetics; The Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA

⁹⁷Department of Radiology, University of Antwerp, Edegem, Belgium

⁹⁸Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospital of Grenoble, Grenoble, France

⁹⁹Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, Azienda Ospedaliera Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

¹⁰⁰Dept. of Neurosurgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands and Dept. of Neurosurgery, Medical Center Haaglanden, The Hague, The Netherlands

¹⁰¹Department of Neurosurgery, Helsinki University Central Hospital

¹⁰²Division of Clinical Neurosciences, Department of Neurosurgery and Turku Brain Injury Center, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland

¹⁰³Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Pitié -Salpêtrière Teaching Hospital, Assistance Publique, Hôpitaux de Paris and University Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France

¹⁰⁴Neurotraumatology and Neurosurgery Research Unit (UNINN), Vall d'Hebron Research Institute, Barcelona, Spain

¹⁰⁵Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of technology and Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

¹⁰⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Rezekne Hospital, Latvia

¹⁰⁷Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain Medicine NHS Lothian & University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

¹⁰⁸Director, MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge Institute of Public Health, Cambridge, UK

¹⁰⁹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Oslo University Hospital/University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

¹¹⁰Division of Orthopedics, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

¹¹¹Institute of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

¹¹²Broad Institute, Cambridge MA Harvard Medical School, Boston MA, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston MA, USA

¹¹³National Trauma Research Institute, The Alfred Hospital, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

¹¹⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

¹¹⁵International Neurotrauma Research Organisation, Vienna, Austria

¹¹⁶Klinik für Neurochirurgie, Klinikum Ludwigsburg, Ludwigsburg, Germany

¹¹⁷Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Preventive Medicine, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

¹¹⁸Department Health and Prevention, University Greifswald, Greifswald, Germany

¹¹⁹Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, AUVA Trauma Hospital, Salzburg, Austria

¹²⁰Department of Neurology, Elisabeth-TweeSteden Ziekenhuis, Tilburg, the Netherlands

¹²¹Department of Neuroanesthesia and Neurointensive Care, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

¹²²Department of Neuromedicine and Movement Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, NTNU, Trondheim, Norway

¹²³Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

¹²⁴Department of Neurosurgery, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary

¹²⁵Division of Neuroscience Critical Care, John Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, USA

¹²⁶Department of Neuropathology, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital and University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

¹²⁷Dept. of Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

¹²⁸Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Milan University, and Neuroscience

ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milano, Italy

¹²⁹Department of Radiation Sciences, Biomedical Engineering, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden

¹³⁰Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group, Center for Health Communication and Participation, School of Psychology and Public Health, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

¹³¹Perioperative Services, Intensive Care Medicine and Pain Management, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland

¹³²Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania

¹³³Intensive Care and Department of Pediatric Surgery, Erasmus Medical Center, Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

¹³⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Kings college London, London, UK

¹³⁵Neurologie, Neurochirurgie und Psychiatrie, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

¹³⁶Department of Intensive Care Adults, Erasmus MC– University Medical Center Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

¹³⁷icoMetrix NV, Leuven, Belgium

¹³⁸Movement Science Group, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK

¹³⁹Psychology Department, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium

¹⁴⁰Director of Neurocritical Care, University of California, Los Angeles, USA

¹⁴¹Department of Neurosurgery, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital, Trondheim, Norway

¹⁴²Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

¹⁴³Department of Neurosurgery, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Berlin, Germany

¹⁴⁴VTT Technical Research Center, Tampere, Finland

¹⁴⁵Section of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada

ORCID

Benjamin Yaël Gravesteyn  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8096-5803>

Charlie Aletta Sewalt  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3270-4814>

Giuseppe Citerio  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5374-3161>

Ari Ercole  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8350-8093>

Hester Floor Lingsma  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2063-9533>

Ewout Willem Steyerberg  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7787-0122>

Andrew I. R. Maas  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1612-1264>

David K. Menon  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3228-9692>

Fiona Elizabeth Lecky  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6806-0921>

References

1. Feigin VL, Nichols E, Alam T, Bannick MS, Beghi E, Blake N, Culpepper WJ, Dorsey ER, Elbaz A, Ellenbogen RG, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of neurological disorders, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Lancet Neurol*. 2019;18(5):459–80. May 1doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(18)30499-X.
2. Majdan M, Plancikova D, Brazinova A, Rusnak M, Nieboer D, Feigin V, et al. Epidemiology of traumatic brain injuries in Europe: a cross-sectional analysis. *Lancet Public Heal*. 2016;1(2):e76–83. Available from: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667\(16\)30017-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpub/article/PIIS2468-2667(16)30017-2/fulltext)
3. Chesnut RM, Marshall LF, Klauber MR, Blunt BA, Baldwin N, Eisenberg HM, et al. The role of secondary brain injury in determining outcome from severe head injury. *J Trauma Inj Infect Crit Care*. 1993;34(2):216–22. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8459458>
4. Davis D, Dunford J, Poste J, Ochs M, Holbrook T, Fortlage D, et al. The Impact of Hypoxia and Hyperventilation on Outcome after Paramedic Rapid Sequence Intubation of Severely Head-injured Patients. *J Trauma Inj Infect Crit Care*. 2004;57(1):1–10. Available from: <https://insights.ovid.com/pubmed?pmid=15284540>
5. Maas AIR, Menon DK, Steyerberg EW, Citerio G, Lecky F, Manley GT, Hill S, Legrand V, Sorgner A, CENTER-TBI Participants and Investigators Collaborative European neuro-trauma effectiveness research in traumatic brain injury (CENTER-TBI): A prospective longitudinal observational study. *Neurosurgery*. 2015;76(1):67–80. doi:10.1227/NEU.0000000000000575.
6. Steyerberg EW, Wiegers E, Sewalt C, Buki A, Citerio G, Keyser VD, et al. Case-mix, care pathways, and outcomes in patients with traumatic brain injury in CENTER-TBI: a European prospective, multicentre, longitudinal, cohort study. *Lancet Neurol*. 2019;18(10):923–34.
7. Cnossen MC, van den Brande R, Lingsma H, Polinder S, Lecky F, Maas A. Prehospital trauma care among 68 European neurotrauma centers: Results of the CENTER-TBI Provider Profiling Questionnaires. *J Neurotrauma*. 2018;36(1):176–181. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29732946>
8. Raj R, Siironen J, Kivisaari R, Kuusma M, Brinck T, Lappalainen J, Skrifvars MB. Factors correlating with delayed trauma center admission following traumatic brain injury. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2013;21(1):67. Available from: <https://sjtrem.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1757-7241-21-67/>.
9. Lodwick G, Edwards L. Paediatric retrieval services: is it better to 'stay and play' or 'scoop and run'? *Br J Hosp Med (Lond)*. 2017;78(2):118[Internet]. Feb 2 [cited 2019 Aug 13]. Available from: <http://www.magonlinelibrary.com/doi/10.12968/hmed.2017.78.2.118>.
10. Nirula R, Maier R, Moore E, Sperry J, Gentilello L. Scoop and run to the trauma center or stay and play at the local hospital: hospital transfer's effect on mortality. *J Trauma*. 2010;69(3):595–9. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20838131>
11. Smith RM, Conn AK. Prehospital care – Scoop and run or stay and play? *Injury*. 2009;40:S23–S6. Available from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020138309005531?via%3Dihub>
12. King S. Stay & play vs. scoop & run. *JEMS*. 2003;28(6):14. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12830791>
13. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, STROBE Initiative. Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ*. 2007;335(7624):806–8. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17947786>.
14. Ringdal KG, Coats TJ, Lefering R, Di Bartolomeo S, Steen PA, Røise O, Handolin L, Lossius HM, Utstein TCD expert panel. The Utstein template for uniform reporting of data following major trauma: a joint revision by SCANTM, TARN, DGU-TR and RITG. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2008;16(1):7. Available from: <http://sjtrem.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1757-7241-16-7>.
15. Steyerberg EW, Mushkudiani N, Perel P, Butcher I, Lu J, McHugh GS, Murray GD, Marmarou A, Roberts I, Habbema JDF, et al. Predicting Outcome after Traumatic Brain Injury: Development and International Validation of Prognostic Scores Based on Admission Characteristics. *Singer M, editor. PLoS Med*. 2008;5(8):e165. Available from: <http://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0050165>.
16. Merlo J, Chaix B, Ohlsson H, Beckman A, Johnell K, Hjerpe P, Råstam L, Larsen K. A brief conceptual tutorial of multilevel analysis in social epidemiology: using measures of clustering in multilevel logistic regression to investigate contextual phenomena. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2006;60(4):290–7. Available from: <http://jech.bmj.com/doi/10.1136/jech.2004.029454>.
17. Cnossen MC, van der Brande R, Lingsma HF, Polinder S, Lecky F, Maas AIR, the CENTER TBI Investigators and Participants. Prehospital Trauma Care among 68 European Neurotrauma Centers: Results of the CENTER-TBI Provider Profiling Questionnaires. *J Neurotrauma*. 2019;36(1):176–81. Available from: <https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/neu.2018.5712>.
18. Cudnik MT, Newgard CD, Wang H, Bangs C, Herrington R. Endotracheal Intubation Increases Out-of-Hospital Time in Trauma Patients. *Prehospital Emerg Care. Prehosp Emerg Care*. 2007;11(2):224–9. Available from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10903120701205208>.
19. Chesnut RM, Marshall SB, Piek J, Blunt BA, Klauber MR, Marshall LF. Early and late systemic hypotension as a frequent and fundamental source of cerebral ischemia following severe brain injury in the Traumatic Coma Data Bank. *Acta Neurochir Suppl (Wien)*. 1993;59:121–5. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8310858>.
20. Miller JD, Sweet RC, Narayan R, Becker DP. Early Insults to the Injured Brain. *JAMA*. 1978;240(5):439. Available from: <http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?doi=10.1001/jama.1978.03290050029011>.
21. Little RJA, Rubin DB. Statistical Analysis with Missing Data. *J Educ Stat*. 1991;16(2):150. Available from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1165119?origin=crossref>.
22. Cnossen MC, Polinder S, Lingsma HF, Maas AIR, Menon D, Steyerberg EW, CENTER-TBI Investigators and Participants. Variation in structure and process of care in traumatic brain injury: Provider profiles of European Neurotrauma

- Centers participating in the CENTER-TBI study. PLoS One. 2016;11(8):e0161367. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0161367](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0161367).
23. Ebben RH, Vloet LC, Verhofstad MH, Meijer S, Groot JAM, van Achterberg T. Adherence to guidelines and protocols in the prehospital and emergency care setting: a systematic review. *Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med*. 2013;21(1):9. Available from: <https://sjtrem.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1757-7241-21-9>.
 24. Cnossen MC, Scholten AC, Lingsma HF, Synnot A, Tavender E, Gantner D, et al. Adherence to Guidelines in Adult Patients with Traumatic Brain Injury: A Living Systematic Review. *J Neurotrauma*. 2016. Available from: <http://www.liebertpub.com/doi/10.1089/neu.2015.4121>.
 25. Neeraj Badjatia A, Carney N, Crocco TJ, Elizabeth Fallat M, Halim A, Hennes FM, Andrew Jagoda FS, et al. Prehospital Guidelines 2nd Edition Guidelines for Prehospital Management of Traumatic Brain Injury. 2006. Available from: <http://www.lifeflightmaine.org/Documents/EMS-and-Hospitals/Research/Brain-Injury/Prehospital-TBI-Management-12-2006.aspx>
 26. Bernard SA, Nguyen V, Cameron P, Masci K, Fitzgerald M, Cooper DJ, et al. Prehospital Rapid Sequence Intubation Improves Functional Outcome for Patients With Severe Traumatic Brain Injury. *Ann Surg*. 2010;252(6):959–65. doi:[10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181efc15f](https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0b013e3181efc15f).
 27. Gravesteijn BY, Sewalt CA, Ercole A, Lecky F, Menon D, Steyerberg EW, et al. Variation in the practice of tracheal intubation in Europe after traumatic brain injury: a prospective cohort study. *Anaesthesia*. 2019;75:7–10. Available from: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/anae.14838>.